

REMARKS

Summary of the Office Action

In the Final Office Action, claims 6 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,933,508 to Fuke et al. (hereinafter "Fuke") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,903,658 to Okazaki et al. (hereinafter "Okazaki"). Claims 7-9, 15 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuke in view of Okazaki and U.S. Patent No. 4,351,411 to Inoue (hereinafter "Inoue").

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank Examiner Kimberly Lockett for the courtesies extended during a telephonic interview with Applicants' undersigned representative on February 26, 2004. During the interview, Applicants' undersigned representative explained the differences between the current claims 6-16 and the art applied in the Final Office Action. In particular, Applicants' undersigned representative indicated that the applied art of record does not teach or suggest speaker combinations as recited in each of independent claims 6 and 13 including a "heat radiation member" as recited in each of these claims. Reference was also made to particular arguments previously made by Applicants in the Response filed on October 14, 2003.

During the interview, as indicated on the Interview Summary Form issued by the Examiner, the Examiner indicated that she was persuaded by the arguments presented by Applicants' undersigned representative and that she agreed to withdraw the rejection against claims 13-16.

With regard to claims 6-12, the Examiner recommended that the final element of independent claim 6 be amended to recite “a separately-provided heat radiation member attached to a heat radiating side...”

Applicants note that on the Interview Summary form issued by the Examiner after this interview, the wording appears as “provided a separate heat radiation member attached to a main ...” Applicants’ undersigned representative respectfully submits that during the interview, the actual language proposed to add to claim 6 was “a separately-provided heat radiation member attached to a heat radiating side...” In the event that Applicants’ understanding of the suggested new claim language as set forth herein is incorrect, the Examiner is requested to inform Applicants of such.

In an effort to advance the prosecution in this case, Applicants are hereby amending independent claim 6 to incorporate the Examiner’s suggested language in this regard. Applicants note that this amendment is being implemented at the Examiner’s request to clarify that the “heat radiation member” recited in independent claim 6 is “separately-provided” from the other elements recited in the claim, such as the “voice coil bobbin,” for example, as discussed in the interview of February 26, 2004.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 6 and 10-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuke in view of Okazaki. Claims 7-9, 15 and 16 remain rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fuke in view of Okazaki and Inoue.

As indicated on the attached Interview Summary form, the Examiner has indicated that as a result of the arguments presented during the Examiner Interview on February 26, 2004, the

previous rejections of claims 13-16 have now been withdrawn. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of these claims has now been rendered moot.

With regard to the remaining claims 6-12, during the interview, as discussed above, the Examiner indicated that if independent claim 6 was amended to recite “a separately-provided heat radiation member attached to a heat radiating side...,” this would overcome the currently-applied references.

Accordingly, Applicants have opted to adopt the Examiner’s suggestion by amending independent claim 6 in this way. As a result, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections of claims 6-12 have also been rendered moot by this amendment to independent claim 6.

As a result, withdrawal of the outstanding rejections of pending claims 6-16 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the entry of this Amendment to place the application in clear condition for allowance or, in the alternative, in better form for appeal.

Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants’ undersigned representative to expedite the prosecution.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required,

including any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account

50-0310. This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR**

EXTENSION OF TIME in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

Dated: March 3, 2004

By: 

Paul A. Fournier

Reg. No. 41,023

MORGAN, LEWIS & BOCKIUS LLP

1111 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20004

Tel: 202-739-3000

Fax: 202-739-3001